REMARKS

This is in response to the Final Office Action mailed on April 12, 2005 in which claims 1-26 were rejected. With this Amendment, claims 1, 4-8, 10-12, 13, 15, 16, 18, and 23 are amended and claims 9 and 14 are canceled. Claims 1-8, 10-13, and 15-26 are pending in this application.

Reversal of Multiple Platform Claim Amendments

In the previous Amendment dated November 8, 2004 various claims were amended to explicitly recite multiple platforms. With this amendment, the prior claim amendments reciting multiple platforms have been reversed.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

In the Office Action, claims 1-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over various combinations of Moriconi (U.S. Patent No. 6,158,010), Andrews (U.S. Patent No. 6,574,736), Boitana (U.S. Patent No. 5,305,456), Serbinis (U.S. Patent No. 6,314,425), Wobber (U.S. Patent No. 5,235,642), Wu (U.S. Patent No. 5,774,551), Kausik (U.S. Patent No. 6,263,446) and the knowledge of a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

With this Amendment, independent claims 1, 13, and 18 have been amended to bring the claims in line with features recited in claim 23. With these amendments, the claims have been more directly focused on features relating to the security broker and security provider, the ways in which these features interact, and the functions that they perform. The prior art of record does not teach or suggest each and every one of these features, the functions that they perform, and the ways in which they interact with each other.

One of the features now recited in the claims is a security provider that performs three functions: authentication, authorization, and receiving permissions requests from a security broker. The prior art does not disclose a security provider that performs these functions. Specific deficiencies of the prior art will now be discussed with reference to the security provider feature of the invention.

The Office Action correctly states that neither Moriconi or Andrews teach a specific authentication means (for example: page 7, no. 14; page 10, no. 16; page 14, no. 22). Since neither of

these references teach a specific authentication means, they do not teach or suggest a security provider that performs authentication. Rather, Moriconi merely makes a general statement that the Moriconi system would work with any authentication means. Moriconi does not specify that the function is performed by any particular portion of the system, and therefore does not teach or suggest a security provider that performs the function of authentication.

Therefore, in order for the rejection under § 103 to be maintained, the security provider that performs each of the specified functions must be taught or suggested by another reference. The other main reference relied upon in the Office Action was Boitana. However, Boitana does not teach or suggest a security provider that performs each of these functions. In the Office Action, the Examiner stated that Boitana does not teach or suggest a plurality of security brokers (Office Action page 17, no. 27). Because Boitana does not teach or suggest a plurality of security brokers, Boitana does not and could not teach or suggest a security provider for receiving permissions requests *from* a security broker.

As can be seen, the claim amendments have also further clarified the role of the security broker in the present invention. The prior art does not teach or suggest a plurality of security brokers that perform the specified functions. The Office Action admits that Boitana does not explicitly teach a plurality of security brokers, but states that Moriconi discloses a means of authorizing users through a plurality of security brokers. (Page 17, no. 27.) Specifically, the office action cites to Moriconi where it states that "multiple authorization engines 316 can be used for added performance and reliability." (Col. 11, lines 12-14.) These authorization engines, however, do not perform all of the functions of the security broker as recited by the claim. For example, the authorization engine does not route permissions requests to one of the security providers. The specific amendments made to each of the independent claims will now be briefly described.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite that determining access rights comprises authenticating a computer user as a valid user with one of a plurality of security providers, authorizing the user to access one fo the secured resources with one of a plurality of security providers, and receiving permissions

requests from a security broker with one of the security providers. Since each and every feature of the claim are not taught or suggested by the prior art, claim 1 is in condition for allowance.

Similarly, claim 13 has been amended to recite that determining access privileges comprises authenticating a user on the system with one of a plurality of security providers, authorizing access rights to the secured resources in the software application with one of a plurality of security providers, and receiving permissions requests from a security broker with one of the security providers. Since each and every feature of the claim are not taught or suggested by the prior art, claim 13 is in condition for allowance.

Claim 18 has also been amended to recite a plurality of security providers for authenticating a computer user, authorizing permissions available to the computer user, and receiving permissions requests, each security provider having a security data store containing data related to authentication and authorization. It has also been amended to recite a plurality of security brokers for routing permissions requests to one of the security providers and for determining access rights to secured resources in the software application based on the permissions received from one of the security providers, each security broker having a data store containing data related to permissions authorized by one of the security providers. Since each and every feature of the claim are not taught or suggested by the prior art, claim 18 is in condition for allowance.

Claim 23 recites authenticating a computer user to a computer security provider, storing the result on the security broker, retrieving a surrogate identifier from the security broker, and authorizing the surrogate identifier to the computer security provider. The computer security provider returns surrogate permissions corresponding to the surrogate identifier, the surrogate permissions for determining access rights to secured resources in the software application according to the surrogate permissions. Since each and every feature of the claim are not taught or suggested by the prior art, claim 23 is in condition for allowance.

Dependent claims 2-8, 10-12; 15-17; 19-22; and 24-26 depend from allowable independent claims 1, 13, 18, and 23 respectively. Therefore, these dependent claims are also allowable. Reconsideration and notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, this application containing pending claims 1-8, 10-13, and 15-26 are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

KINNEY & LANGE, P.A.

Date: _6/13/05_

By: _____
David R. Fairbairn, Reg. No. 26,047
THE KINNEY & LANGE BUILDING
312 South Third Street
Minneapolis, MN 55415-1002
Telephone: (612) 339-1863
Fax: (612) 339-6580

BAT